arXiv:1407.2684v2 [math.CO] 13 Feb 2015

h-POLYNOMIALS OF REDUCTION TREES

KAROLA MÉSZÁROS

Abstract. We develop a method of proving nonnegativity of the coefficients of certain polynomials, also called reduced forms, defined by Kirillov in his quasi-classical Yang-Baxter algebra, its abelianization and related algebras. It has been shown previously that the relations of the abelianization of the quasi-classical Yang-Baxter algebra, also called the subdivision algebra, encode ways of subdividing flow polytopes. In turn, these subdivisions can be represented as reduced forms, or as reduction trees. We use reduction trees in the subdivision algebra to construct canonical triangulations of flow polytopes which are shellable. We explain how a shelling of the canonical triangulation can be read off from the corresponding reduction tree in the subdivision algebra. We then introduce the notion of shellable reduction trees in the subdivision and related algebras and define h-polynomials of reduction trees. In the case of the subdivision algebra, the h-polynomials of the canonical triangulations of flow polytopes equal the h-polynomials of the corresponding reduction trees, which motivated our definition. We show that the reduced forms in various algebras, which can be read off from the leaves of the reduction trees, specialize to the shifted h-polynomials of the corresponding reduction trees. This yields a technique for proving nonnegativity properties of reduced forms. As a corollary we settle a conjecture of A.N. Kirillov.

Contents

1. Introduction 1
2. Definitions and Prelimiaries 3
2.1. Flow polytopes and their subdivisions. 3
2.2. Algebras related to flow polytopes. 5
3. Weak embeddability and shelling triangulations 6
4. Strong embeddability and a description of the leaves of $R_G^{\mathcal{O}}$ 10
5. Refining h-vectors of the canonical triangulation of $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{G}}$ 13
6. The weak and strong embeddable properties of partial reduction trees 15
7. Solving Kirillov's Conjecture 7 17
Acknowledgements 19
8. Appendix 20
References 24

1. Introduction

Nonnegativity properties abound in mathematics, and whenever one arises, the most satisfying explanation of integer nonnegativity is to demonstrate what a certain nonnegative quantity counts. The present paper is written in this spirit and explains nonnegativity properties of polynomials using combinatorial abstractions of geometric ideas. This is a follow up on the paper [10] where the author proved that certain polynomials called shifted reduced forms in the subdivision algebra have nonnegative coefficients by showing that they equal h-polynomials of triangulations of flow polytopes. The methods used in [10] are entirely geometric, and the purpose of this paper is the

Date: September 5, 2014.

The author was partially supported by a National Science Foundation Postdoctoral Research Fellowship (DMS 1103933).

abstraction of geometric ideas related (though not identical) to those in [10]. Before elaborating further, we say a few words on the reduced forms we study and their origins.

The polynomials we study are reduced forms introduced by Kirillov in the quasi-classical Yang-Baxter algebra and its abelianization. These algebras were defined by A.N. Kirillov [4, 5, 6] with Schubert calculus in mind and the former is closely related to the Fomin-Kirillov algebra [3]. The abelianization of the quasi-classical Yang-Baxter algebra has been considered by the present author under the name subdivision algebra, since its relations encode ways to subdivide root and flow polytopes [9, 8, 7]. The polynomials of interest in this paper arise as reduced forms in the above algebras; the reduced form of a monomial in an algebra is obtained via substitution rules dictated by the relations of the algebra.

This paper has two components: Sections 3-5 contain the construction and study of canonical triangulations of flow polytopes, while Sections 6 and 7 present a method for studying reduced forms in various algebras. These two components can be understood without reference to each other, although the ideas in Sections 3-5 serve as the motivation for the methods and justification for the names of the notions introduced in Sections 6 and 7.

The essence of the subdivision algebra is that the reduced form of a monomial in it can naturally be seen as a dissection of a flow polytope corresponding to the monomial into simplices. Any dissection obtained from a reduced form can be graphically represented by reduction trees, which are simply a way of encoding a substitution procedure dictated by the relations of an algebra. We show that there is a **canonical triangulation** of any flow polytope that can be obtained as a dissection encoded by a reduced form (or reduction tree), see Theorem 2. Moreover, we show in Theorem 3 that the canonical triangulations we constructed are shellable. The canonical triangulations constructed here are different from the triangulations considered in [10] and it is the geometry of the canonical triangulations that we abstract to the structural study of a reduction trees.

Motivated by the considerations for canonical triangulations, we establish a framework for studying reduced forms in several related algebras. This is done in Sections 6 and 7 and we note that these sections are self-contained, and the reader interested in these applications can start there directly. We introduce a notion alike **shellability for reduction trees** (which we call strong embeddability), inspired by the geometric notion. We also define h-polynomials of reduction trees. The **h-polynomials of certain reduction trees in the subdivision algebra equal the h-polynomials of canonical triangulations of flow polytopes**, which was the motivation for our definition of h-polynomials of reduction trees.

We show that the **reduced forms in various algebras specialize to the shifted h-polynomials of the corresponding reduction trees**, see Theorems 13 and 15. This yields a technique for proving nonnegativity results for reduced forms. This technique is related, though different from the one established for proving nonnegativity of shifted reduced forms in subdivision algebras in [10], since our method relies on the study of h-polynomials of reduction trees as opposed to h-polynomials of triangulations. As a corollary to our results we settle a conjecture of A.N. Kirillov, see Theorem 16.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we define flow polytopes. Next we explain how to subdivide flow polytopes and how we can encode the subdivisions with a reduction tree. Then we define the (multiparameter) subdivision algebra as well as the (multiparameter) associative quasi-classical Yang-Baxter algebra of A.N. Kirillov.

In Section 3 we construct canonical triangulations for flow polytopes and introduce the notion of weak embeddability of reduction trees in order to construct a particular shelling order for the canonical triangulations. In Section 4 we introduce the notion of strong embeddability of reduction trees and indicate how to use it to give a description of the full set of leaves of the reduction tree in the special reduction order $\mathcal{O}$. In Section 5 we study a refinement of the h-vector for our canonical triangulations.

Section 6 parts from geometry and focuses on the structure of reduction trees which became apparent in the previous sections. While the Sections 3-5 are helpful for understanding the motivation for the notions in Section 6, this section is self-contained and can be read without reading the previous ones. We introduce weak and strong embeddable properties of partial reduction trees, key notions that are seen to unify our proofs. We also define the h-polynomial of a reduction tree and show that it equals the specialized (shifted) reduced form. We generalize our results from reduction trees to partial reduction trees. As a corollary we prove special cases of Conjecture 7 of A.N. Kirillov [5] in Section 7 and demonstrate via counterexamples that Conjecture 7 [5] cannot hold in its full generality.

In Section 8 we prove that our canonical triangulation is indeed a triangulation. We postpone this proof to the end as it is technical, and its ideas are not used elsewhere in the paper.

2. Definitions and Prelimiaries

For completeness, in this section we include several key definitions used throughout the paper, following [10]. For further details see [10].

2.1. **Flow polytopes and their subdivisions.**

Definition 1. Given a loopless graph G on the vertex set $[n]$, let $\text{in}(e)$ denote the smallest (initial) vertex of edge e and $\text{fin}(e)$ the biggest (final) vertex of edge e. Let $E(G) = \{\{e_1, \ldots, e_l\}\}$ be the multiset of edges of G. We correspond variables x_{e_i}, $i \in [l]$, to the edges of G, of which we think as flows. The **flow polytope** $\mathcal{F}_G$ is naturally embedded into $\mathbb{R}^{\#E(G)}$, where x_{e_i}, $i \in [l]$, are thought of as the coordinates. $\mathcal{F}_G$ is defined by

$$x_{e_i} \geq 0, \ i \in [l],$$

$$1 = \sum_{e \in E(G), \text{in}(e)=1} x_e = \sum_{e \in E(G), \text{fin}(e)=n+1} x_e,$$

and for $2 \leq i \leq n$

$$\sum_{e \in E(G), \text{fin}(e)=i} x_e = \sum_{e \in E(G), \text{in}(e)=i} x_e.$$

Flow polytopes lend themselves to subdivisions via *reductions*, as explained below. A similar property of root polytopes was established in [8, 9].

Definition 2. Given a graph G on the vertex set $[n]$ containing edges (i,j) and (j,k), $i < j < k$, performing the **reduction** on these edges of G yields three graphs on the vertex set $[n]$:

$$\begin{aligned} E(G_1) &= E(G) \backslash \{(j,k)\} \cup \{(i,k)\}, \\ E(G_2) &= E(G) \backslash \{(i,j)\} \cup \{(i,k)\}, \\ E(G_3) &= E(G) \backslash \{(i,j),(j,k)\} \cup \{(i,k)\}. \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

Denote by $((i,j),(j,k),L)$ the reduction that took place to get from G to G_1, by $((i,j),(j,k),R)$ the reduction that took place to get from G to G_2 and $((i,j),(j,k),M)$ the reduction that took place to get from G to G_3. L, R, M correspond to "left, right, middle."

Definition 3. A **reduction tree** R_G of a graph G is a tree with nodes labeled by graphs and such that all non-leaf nodes of R_G have three children. The root is labeled by G. If there are two edges $(i,j),(j,k) \in E(G)$, $i < j < k$, on which we choose to do a reduction, then the children of the root are labeled by G_1, G_2 and G_3 as in (1). Next, continue this way by constructing reduction trees for G_1, G_2 and G_3. If some graph has no edges $(i,j),(j,k)$, $i < j < k$, then it is its own reduction



FIGURE 1. A reduction tree of $G = ([4], \{(1,2),(2,3),(3,4)\})$. The edges on which the reductions are performed are in bold.

tree. Note that the reduction tree R_G is not unique; it depends on our choice of edges to reduce. However, the number of leaves (referring to the graph labeling a leaf) of all reduction trees of G with a given number of edges is the same, see [10, Lemma 5]. We choose a particular embedding of the reduction tree in the plane for convenience: we root it at G with the tree growing downwards, and such that the left child is G_1, the middle child is G_3 and the right child is G_2; see Figure 1. The leaves which have the same number of edges at the root are called **full dimensional**.

Definition 4. Let the edges of G be $e_1, \ldots, e_k$, where we distinguish multiple edges. If a reduction involving edges $a = (i,j)$ and $b = (j,k)$ of G is performed, then the new edge (i,k) appearing in all three graphs as in (1) is formally thought of as $a + b$. The other edges stay unchanged. To get to leaves G_1 and G_2 of R_G we iterate this process, thereby expressing the edges of any leaf as a sum of edges of the graph being the root of the reduction tree. Two edges c and d in the graphs G_1 and G_2, respectively, are the same, if they are the sum of exactly the same edges of G. The intersection of two graphs G_1 and G_2 in a reduction tree R_G is $G_1 \cap G_2 = (V(G), E(G_1) \cap E(G_2))$, where if $e \in E(G_1) \cap E(G_2)$ then as explained above e is the sum of the same edges of G in both G_1 and G_2.

By abuse of notation we will write $G - e$ to mean the graph G with edge e deleted and $G + e$ to mean the graph G with edge e added .

Definition 5. The **augmented graph** $\widetilde{G}$ of $G = ([n], E)$ is $\widetilde{G} = ([n] \cup \{s,t\}, \widetilde{E})$, where s (source) is the smallest, t (target/sink) is the biggest vertex of $[n] \cup \{s,t\}$, and $\widetilde{E} = E \cup \{(s,i),(i,t) | i \in [n]\}$. Denote by $\mathcal{P}(\widetilde{G})$ the set of all maximal paths in $\widetilde{G}$, referred to as **routes**. It is well known that the unit flows sent along the routes in $\mathcal{P}(\widetilde{G})$ are the vertices of $\mathcal{F}(\widetilde{G})$.

Definition 6. Consider a node G_1 of the reduction tree R_G, where each edge of G_1 is considered as a sum of the edges of G. The image of the map $m : E(G_1) \to \mathcal{P}(\widetilde{G})$ which takes an edge $(v_1, v_2) = e = e_{i_1} + \cdots + e_{i_l}$, $e \in G_1$, $e_{i_j} \in E(G)$, $j \in [l]$, to the route $(s, v_1), e_{i_1}, \ldots, e_{i_l}, (v_2, t)$ gives the vertices of $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{G_1}}$ (by taking the unit flows on these routes). In case G_1 is not a node of the reduction tree R_G, but it is an intersection of nodes of R_G, so that each edge of G_1 can still be considered as a sum of the edges of G, we still define $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{G_1}}$ as above. This definition of $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{G_1}}$ is of course with respect to G, and this is understood from the context.

Using the above definitions the proof of the following lemma is an easy exercise.

Lemma 1. [7, Proposition 1],[11, Proposition 4.1], [12, 13] *Given a graph G on the vertex set $[n]$ and $(i,j),(j,k) \in E(G)$, for some $i<j<k$, with G_1, G_2, G_3 as in (1) and $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{G_i}}$, $i \in [3]$, as in Definition 6 we have*

$$\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{G}} = \mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{G_1}} \bigcup \mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{G_2}}, \mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{G_1}} \bigcap \mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{G_2}} = \mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{G_3}} \text{ and } \mathcal{F}^{\circ}_{\widetilde{G_1}} \bigcap \mathcal{F}^{\circ}_{\widetilde{G_2}} = \emptyset,$$

where $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{G}}$, $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{G_1}}$, $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{G_2}}$ are of the same dimension $d-1$, $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{G_3}}$ is $d-2$ dimensional, and $\mathcal{P}^{\circ}$ denotes the interior of $\mathcal{P}$.

2.2. **Algebras related to flow polytopes.** Note that the reduction of graphs given in (1) can be encoded as the following relation:

$$x_{ij}x_{jk} = x_{ik}x_{ij} + x_{jk}x_{ik} + \beta x_{ik}, \text{ for } 1 \leq i < j < k \leq n. \tag{2}$$

If we wanted to preserve more information on the actual reduction, we could instead consider the following relation:

$$x_{ij}x_{jk} = x_{ik}x_{ij} + x_{jk}x_{ik} + \beta_i x_{ik}, \text{ for } 1 \leq i < j < k \leq n. \tag{3}$$

These relations give rise to what we call *subdivision algebras*.

Definition 7. The multiparameter associative **subdivision algebra** of weight $\mathfrak{b} = (\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_{n-1})$, denoted by $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{b})$, is an associative algebra, over the ring of polynomials $\mathbb{Z}[\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_{n-1}]$, generated by the set of elements $\{x_{ij} : 1 \leq i < j \leq n\}$, subject to the relations:

(a) $x_{ij}x_{kl} = x_{kl}x_{ij}$, if $i<j$, $k<l$,

(b) $x_{ij}x_{jk} = x_{ik}x_{ij} + x_{jk}x_{ik} + \beta_i x_{ik}$, if $1 \leq i < j < k \leq n$.

Letting $\beta_i = \beta$, $i \in [n-1]$, the algebra $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{b})$ specializes to the subdivision algebra of weight β denoted by $\mathcal{S}(\beta)$.

The algebra $\mathcal{S}(\beta)$ has been studied in [8] and [10].

Definition 8. Given a monomial M in $\mathcal{S}(\beta)$ or $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{b})$, its reduced form is defined as follows. Starting with $p_0 = M$, produce a sequence of polynomials $p_0, p_1, \ldots, p_m$ in the following fashion. To obtain p_{r+1} from p_r, choose a term of p_r which is divisible by $x_{ij}x_{jk}$, for some i,j,k, and replace the factor $x_{ij}x_{jk}$ in this term with $x_{ik}x_{ij} + x_{jk}x_{ik} + \beta x_{ik}$ or $x_{ij}x_{jk} = x_{ik}x_{ij} + x_{jk}x_{ik} + \beta_i x_{ik}$, depending on which algebra we are in. Note that p_{r+1} has two more terms than p_r. Continue this process until a polynomial p_m is obtained, in which no term is divisible by $x_{ij}x_{jk}$, for any i,j,k. Such a polynomial p_m is a **reduced form** of M. Note that we allow the use of the commutation relations of each algebra in this process.

Given a monomial M in $\mathcal{S}(\beta)$ or $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{b})$ we can encode it by a graph G_M, simply by letting the edges of G be the given by the indices of the variables in M. Denote a reduced form of M in $\mathcal{S}(\beta)$ by $Q^{\mathcal{S}(\beta)}_{G_M}(\mathbf{x};\beta)$ and the reduced form of M in $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{b})$ by $Q^{\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{b})}_{G_M}(\mathbf{x};\mathfrak{b})$. If in the reduced forms we set $\mathbf{x} = (1, \ldots, 1)$, then in the notation we omit $\mathbf{x}$: $Q^{\mathcal{S}(\beta)}_{G_M}(\beta)$ or $Q^{\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{b})}_{G_M}(\mathfrak{b})$.

It is easy to see that by definition, the reduced form of a monomial in the subdivision algebras can be read off from the reduction tree of the corresponding graph obtained by simply taking its edge set to the the double indices of the variables of the monomial.

Note that the reduced form of a monomial in $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{b})$ or $\mathcal{S}(\beta)$ is not necessarily unique, which could be a desirable property. The noncommutative counterpart of $\mathcal{S}(\beta)$, denoted by $\widetilde{ACYB}_n(\beta)$ and defined by Kirillov [5, 6], is much like $\mathcal{S}(\beta)$, but with reduced forms unique [8]. While the same is not true of the similar noncommutative generalization, denoted $M\widetilde{ACYB}_n(\mathfrak{b})$, of $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{b})$, this algebra also has beautiful combinatorics. It was A.N. Kirillov [5, 6] who introduced these algebras and shed the first light on their rich combinatorial structure.

Definition 9. [5, Definitions 3.1 and 3.2] The multiparameter associative **quasi-classical Yang-Baxter algebra** of weight $\mathfrak{b} = (\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_{n-1})$, denoted by $M\widetilde{ACYB}_n(\mathfrak{b})$, is an associative algebra, over the ring of polynomials $\mathbb{Z}[\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_{n-1}]$, generated by the set of elements $\{x_{ij} : 1 \leq i < j \leq n\}$, subject to the relations:

(a) $x_{ij}x_{kl} = x_{kl}x_{ij}$, if $\{i, j\} \cap \{k, l\} = \emptyset$,

(b) $x_{ij}x_{jk} = x_{ik}x_{ij} + x_{jk}x_{ik} + \beta_i x_{ik}$, if $1 \leq i < j < k \leq n$.

Letting $\beta_i = \beta$, $i \in [n-1]$, the algebra $M\widetilde{ACYB}_n(\mathfrak{b})$ specializes to the associative quasi-classical Yang-Baxter algebra of weight β, denoted by $\widetilde{ACYB}_n(\beta)$.

The definition of reduced forms in $\widetilde{ACYB}_n(\beta)$ and $M\widetilde{ACYB}_n(\mathfrak{b})$ is the similar to Definition 8; the only difference is that now the order of variables matters and so we take consecutive variables x_{ij} and x_{jk} and replace them by $x_{ik}x_{ij} + x_{jk}x_{ik} + \beta_i x_{ik}$. E.g., while in $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{b})$ the monomial $x_{jk}x_{ij}$ could be reduced, it is itself a reduced form in $M\widetilde{ACYB}_n(\mathfrak{b})$. One can also define the notion of a reduction tree for these algebras, which, in the terminology of Section 6 can be seen as partial reduction trees with respect to the subdivision algebra.

3. Weak embeddability and shelling triangulations

In [10] we studied several regular triangulations of $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{G}}$ relying on the work of Danilov, Karzanov and Koshevoy [2]. They have posed the question of whether the triangulations they construct in [2] are all of the regular triangulations of flow polytopes. The aims of this section are twofold. First, we construct a triangulation of $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{G}}$ which is not one of those constructed in [2]. We prove that our triangulation is shellable. We leave the question of whether it is regular open for further investigation. Second, we introduce the notion of *weak embeddabiliy of reduction trees* which can be extended even when we are not using the geometry of triangulations.

The triangulation we consider in this section is obtained from the reduction tree $R_G^{\mathcal{O}}$, which is a reduction tree where the reductions are executed in a certain order $\mathcal{O}$. The reduction order $\mathcal{O}$ is defined as follows. Given an arbitrary graph G on the vertex set $[n]$, do the reductions in G proceeding from the smallest vertex towards the greatest in order. Look for the smallest vertex v which is nonalternating, that is that has both an edge (a, v) and an edge (v, b) incident to it, with $a < v < b$. Look at the two topmost edges at v, that is edges (a, v) and (v, b) such that $a < v < b$ and there are no edges (a', v) with $a' < a$ and (v, b') with $b < b'$. Do the reduction on the two topmost edges at v. Continue in this fashion on each leaf of the partial reduction tree ultimately arriving to the reduction tree $R_G^{\mathcal{O}}$ with all leaves alternating graphs, that is all of their vertices are alternating. For a reduction tree $R_G^{\mathcal{O}}$ see Figure 2.

Since the proof is technical, and not of central importance to the rest of the paper, we state Theorem 2 here and refer the reader to Section 8 for a proof.

Theorem 2. *The simplices corresponding to the full dimensional leaves of $R_G^{\mathcal{O}}$ induce a triangulation; that is, the intersection of any two of them is a face of both. Moreover, the simplices corresponding to all leaves of $R_G^{\mathcal{O}}$ are part of this triangulation.*

We note that the set of $R_G^{\mathcal{O}}$-triangulation we obtain as described in Theorem 2 are not a subset of the triangulations constructed in [2]; for example, considering the graph $G = ([6], \{(1, 3), (3, 4), (4, 5), (2, 4), (4, 6)\})$, regardless of the framing of $\widetilde{G}$, we can obtain routes which are noncoherent at vertex 4 to be vertices of a top dimensional simplex in the $R_G^{\mathcal{O}}$-triangulation.

Instrumental in this section is the order of the leaves of $R_G^{\mathcal{O}}$: let $F_1, \ldots, F_l$ be the full dimensional leaves of $R_G^{\mathcal{O}}$ in depth-first search order as shown in Figure 2. Remember that we have an embedding of $R_G^{\mathcal{O}}$ in the plane where G is the root and the graphs G_1, G_2, G_3 as in (1) are the left, right, middle child, respectively. Also, by Theorem 2 the simplices $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_1}}, \ldots, \mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_l}}$ are the top dimensional simplices in a triangulation of $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{G}}$; we refer to this triangulation as the **canonical triangulation** of $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{G}}$.



FIGURE 2. The reduction tree of $G = ([5], \{(1,3),(2,3),(3,4),(3,5)\})$ with reductions executed in order $\mathcal{O}$. The labels F_i, $i \in [6]$, are explained in Theorems 3 and 5.

Theorem 3 is the main result of this section, and the weak embeddable property in Definition 10 introduced to prove this theorem is the essential ingredient we carry forward to less geometric settings.

Theorem 3. *$\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_1}}, \ldots, \mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_l}}$ is a shelling order of the canonical triangulation of $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{G}}$.*

Definition 10. A reduction tree R_G is said to have the **(right) weak embeddable property** if one of the following is true for every node H of R_G:

1. H is a leaf
2. the middle child of H is H_3 and the right child of H is H_2, satisfying that there is a map b_H from the full dimensional leaves of the subtree R_{H_3} of R_G (leaves with $|E(H_3)|$ number of edges) into the full dimensional leaves of the subtree R_{H_2} (leaves with $|E(H_2)|$ number of edges) of R_G such that if $b_H(L) = L'$, then $E(L') = E(L) \cup \{e\}$ with $e \notin E(L)$. Moreover, if L' is a full dimensional leaf of R_{H_2} such that there is a leaf L of R_{H_3} with the property that $E(L') = E(L) \cup \{e\}$ with $e \notin E(L)$, then L is in the image of b_H and b_H is a bijection from the full dimensional leaves of R_{H_3} onto its image. Moreover, there is a unique L in R_{H_3} such that $E(L') = E(L) \cup \{e\}$ with $e \notin E(L)$.

Definition 11. A reduction tree R_G is said to have the **left weak embeddable property** if it satisfies the conditions of Definition 10 when we replace H_2 by H_1 in the statement.

Definition 12. A reduction tree R_G is said to have the **twosided weak embeddable property** if it has both the right and the left weak embeddable property.

Lemma 4. *The reduction tree $R_G^{\mathcal{O}}$ has the twosided weak embeddable property.*

Before proving Lemma 4, we define the map b_H on its non-leaves which we will show satisfies 2. in Definition 10.

Definition 13. When performing a reduction (a, b, X), $X \in \{M, L, R\}$ (notation as in Definition 2), we say that the edge a is **dropped** when $X = M, R$, and a is **kept** if $X = L$. Similarly, edge b is dropped when $X = M, L$, and b is kept if $X = R$. We also say that an edge e is **derived from the edge** b if it resulted as a sequence of reductions involving b, or sums of edges of b, and e itself is a sum of edges with b. We also signal this by saying that e is a b^*-edge.

Definition 14. Consider a non-leaf node H of $R_G^{\mathcal{O}}$ and let the reduction performed at H be (a, b) yielding middle child H_3 and right child H_2. Define the map b_H from the full dimensional leaves of $R_{H_3}^{\mathcal{O}}$, denoted $FL_{H_3}^{\mathcal{O}}$, into the full dimensional leaves of $R_{H_2}^{\mathcal{O}}$, denoted $FL_{H_2}^{\mathcal{O}}$, as

follows. Let $(a,b,M),(c_1,d_1,X_1),(c_2,d_2,X_2),\dots,(c_k,d_k,X_k)$ for edges c_i,d_i, and $X_i\in\{L,R\}$, $i\in[k]$, be the sequence of reductions leading to $L\in FL^{\mathcal{O}}_{H_3}$ from H. Recall that since the order $\mathcal{O}$ of reductions is specified, we are only wondering at each step whether to go L or R. Then $b_H(L)$ is defined as the element of $FL^{\mathcal{O}}_{H_2}$ obtained from H by the sequence of reductions $(a,b,R),(a_1,b_1,Y_1),(a_2,b_2,Y_2),\dots,(a_l,b_l,Y_l)$ (here again the pair of edge a_i,b_i is determined by the sequence $(a,b,R),(a_1,b_1,Y_1),(a_2,b_2,Y_2),\dots,(a_{i-1},b_{i-1},Y_{i-1})$), where if $(a_i,b_i)=(c_j,d_j)$, then $Y_j=X_j$ and if $(a_i,b_i)\neq(c_j,d_j)$, then it follows that a_i or b_i is an edge derived from b, but not derived from $a+b$. In this case we choose Y_i so that the edge derived from b is dropped in the reduction.

Proof of Lemma 4. Consider a node H of $R^{\mathcal{O}}_G$. If H is a leaf, there is nothing to check. If H is not a leaf, we claim that the map b_H defined in Definition 14 satisfies property 2. of Definition 10. In this proof when we refer to a b^*-edge, we mean a b^*-edge not derived from $a+b$.

Let S be the set of full dimensional leaves of $R^{\mathcal{O}}_{H_2}$ obtained by a sequence of reductions that either do not involve a b^*-edge, or if the reduction involves a b^*-edge, then in the reduction we go towards the outcome where this b^*-edge is dropped. Clearly, the image of b_H is in S. We now show that the inverse of b_H is defined on S. Indeed, if the leaf L' in S was obtained by a series of reductions on the pairs of edges $(a,b,R),(a_1,b_1,X_1),(a_2,b_2,X_2),\dots,(a_l,b_l,X_l)$ of which $(a_{i_1},b_{i_1}),(a_{i_2},b_{i_2}),\dots,(a_{i_m},b_{i_m})$ are the ones involving b^*-edges, then the sequence of reductions $(a,b,M),(a_1,b_1,X_1),(a_2,b_2,X_2),\dots,(a_l,b_l,X_l)$ with the reductions $(a_{i_1},b_{i_1},X_{i_1}),(a_{i_2},b_{i_2},X_{i_2}),\dots,$ $(a_{i_m},b_{i_m},X_{i_m})$ deleted, is a valid sequence of reductions in $R^{\mathcal{O}}_{H_3}$ leading to a leaf L, and the map b_H takes L to L'. Note also that if $L'\notin S$ is a full dimensional leaf of $R^{\mathcal{O}}_{H_2}$ not in S, then it contains more than one b^*-edge, in which case it cannot be that $E(L')=E(L)\cup\{e\}$ with $e\notin E(L)$, for some leaf $L\in FL^{\mathcal{O}}_{H_3}$. Moreover, if $L'\in S$, then it has a unique b^*-edge and thus it is the image of a unique L in R_{H_3}.

To prove that $R^{\mathcal{O}}_G$ has the left embedabble property, one can define an analogous map b^L_H, where the role of b is played by the edge a. □

Next we define the depth of a reduction tree.

Definition 15. Let $\mathrm{dep}(G)$, the **depth of** $R^{\mathcal{O}}_G$, be the maximum length of a path in $R^{\mathcal{O}}_G$ from G to a leaf.

Proof of Theorem 3. We prove by induction on $\mathrm{dep}(G)$, that $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_1}},\dots,\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_l}}$ is a shelling order. Let G_1,G_2, and G_3 be the left, right, and middle child of G, respectively, in $R^{\mathcal{O}}_G$ after having performed a reduction on edges a and b. Let $F_1,\dots,F_k$ be the full dimensional leaves of $R^{\mathcal{O}}_{G_1}$, $F_{k+1},\dots,F_l$ be the full dimensional leaves of $R^{\mathcal{O}}_{G_2}$, and $Q_1,\dots,Q_z$ be the full dimensional leaves of $R^{\mathcal{O}}_{G_3}$ in depth first search order. By induction hypothesis $F_1,\dots,F_k$ and $F_{k+1},\dots,F_l$ and $Q_1,\dots,Q_z$ are shelling orders of the canonical triangulations of $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{G_1}},\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{G_2}}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{G_3}}$, respectively, obtained via the order $\mathcal{O}$. There are several things we prove in order to prove that $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_1}},\dots,\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_l}}$ is a shelling order. Let S be the image of b_G in $R^{\mathcal{O}}_{G_2}$ as constructed in the proof of Lemma 4 and let $\bar{S}$ be the full dimensional leaves of $R^{\mathcal{O}}_{G_2}$ not in S. Then, to prove Theorem 3 it suffices to prove Claims 1 and 2:

Claim 1. for $F_i\in\bar{S}$,

$$\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_i}}\cap(\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_1}}\cup\cdots\cup\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_{i-1}}})=\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_i}}\cap(\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_{k+1}}}\cup\cdots\cup\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_{i-1}}}) \tag{4}$$

Claim 2. for $F_i\in S$,

$$\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_i}}\cap(\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_1}}\cup\cdots\cup\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_{i-1}}})=\big(\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_i}}\cap(\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_{k+1}}}\cup\cdots\cup\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_{i-1}}})\big)\cup\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{b_G^{-1}(F_i)}} \tag{5}$$

By Lemma 1 we have

$$\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{G_1}}\cap\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{G_2}}=\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{G_3}}, \tag{6}$$

which can also be written as

$$(\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_1}} \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_k}}) \cap (\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_{k+1}}} \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_l}}) = \mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{Q_1}} \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{Q_z}}. \tag{7}$$

Let $b_G(Q_j) = F_{i_j}$, $j \in [z]$, $k+1 \leq i_j \leq l$; that is, $F_{i_j} = Q_j + e$. Using Theorem 18 for the graphs Q_j and F_{i_j} together with Corollary 22 we can conclude that $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{Q_j}}$ is a facet of $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_{i_j}}}$. Using in addition the properties of b_G as given in Definition 10 we can also conclude that $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{Q_j}}$ is not a facet of any other $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_i}}$ for $k+1 \leq i \leq l$, $i \neq i_j$. Moreover, since $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_1}}, \ldots, \mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_l}}$ are the top dimensional simplices in the canonical triangulation of $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{G}}$ for which (7) holds, we have that

$$\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{Q_j}} \subset (\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_1}} \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_k}}) \cap \mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_{i_j}}}. \tag{8}$$

By the above together with Theorem 2, we have that if $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_i}}$, $k+1 \leq i \leq l$, is not in the image of b_G then $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_i}}$ does not attach on a facet to $(\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_1}} \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_k}})$, and if $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_i}}$, $k+1 \leq i \leq l$, is in the image of b_G then $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_i}}$ attaches on exactly one facet $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{b_G^{-1}(F_i)}}$ to $(\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_1}} \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_k}})$. Thus, we have identified all the facets on which the $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_i}}$'s, $k+1 \leq i \leq l$, attach to previous simplices in the canonical triangulation and they agree with the facets specified in Claims 1 and 2 above. In order to finish the proof of Claims 1 and 2, and thus that we have a shelling, it remains to prove that the $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_i}}$'s, $k+1 \leq i \leq l$, only attach on facets and not on lower dimensional faces to $(\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_1}} \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_{i-1}}})$. This is what we do next.

In light of Theorem 18, Corollary 22 and Theorem 23 what needs to be checked is as follows: if $H_a = F_a \cap F_i$, for $a \in [k]$ and some fixed $i \in [k+1, l]$, with $|E(H_a)| < |E(F_i)| - 1$, then $H_a \subset F_i \cap b_G^{-1}(F_i)$, if this is well defined, or $H_a \subset (F_r \cap F_i)$, for some $r \in [k+1, i-1]$. Note that if $b_G^{-1}(F_i)$ is well defined, then F_i has exactly one b^*-edge e, which is not derived from $a+b$, where the reduction at G is performed on the edges a and b, and this b^*-edge e cannot appear in any leaf of $R_{G_3}^{\mathcal{O}}$, thus $H_a \subset b_G^{-1}(F_i) = F_i - e$. Also note that if $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_i}}$ attaches on at least two facets to $(\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_{k+1}}} \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_{i-1}}})$, say as an intersection with $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_c}}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_d}}$, $k+1 \leq c \neq d \leq i-1$, then H_a is subset of at least one of F_c or F_d. Thus, it remains to deal with the case where $b_G^{-1}(F_i)$ is not well defined (and so F_i has at least two b^*-edges not derived from $a+b$) and F_i attaches on exactly one facet to $(\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_{k+1}}} \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_{i-1}}})$. Since $b_G^{-1}(F_{k+1}) = Q_1$, then $i > k+1$. Since $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_{k+1}}}, \ldots, \mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_l}}$ is a shelling order by induction, it follows that $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_i}}$ attaches on exactly one facet to $(\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_{k+1}}} \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_{i-1}}})$ and on no lower dimensional face.

Let the facet on which $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_i}}$ attaches to $(\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_{k+1}}} \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_{i-1}}})$ be the intersection of $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_i}}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_j}}$, $k+1 \leq j < i$, with $F_i \cap F_j = F_i - f(d)$ for some edge $f(d)$ of F_i, which we describe shortly. Consider the path from G to F_i in $R_G^{\mathcal{O}}$. Let the node of $R_G^{\mathcal{O}}$ where the last right edge is taken on the path from G to F_i be H. Let the reduction done at H be on the edges $c = (i, j)$ and $d = (j, k)$ for $i < j < k$. Let H_1, H_2, H_3 be the left, right and middle children of H. Then, $F_i = b_H(Q)$ for a graph $Q \in R_{H_3}^{\mathcal{O}}$, where $E(F_i) = E(Q) \cup \{f(d)\}$, where $f(d)$ is a d^*-edge not derived from $c+d$. Since $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_i}}$ attaches on exactly one facet to $(\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_{k+1}}} \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_{i-1}}})$ and on no lower dimensional face, it follows that the graphs $F_{k+1}, \ldots, F_{i-1}$ do not contain the edge $f(d)$.

Let the sequence of reductions leading from G to F_i be $s = (s_0, s_1, \ldots, s_z)$, where $s_0 = (a, b, R)$ and $s_i = (c_i, d_i, X_i)$ for some pair of edges c_i, d_i, $i \in [z]$, and $X_i \in \{L, R\}$. We now establish what it means for edge $f(d)$ to be an edge of a leaf of $R_G^{\mathcal{O}}$, in terms of the reductions leading to it.

Let $f(d) = e_1 + \ldots + e_l$, where e_i, $i \in [l]$, are edges of G. Let the reductions on e_1 and e_2, on $e_1 + e_2$ and $e_3, \ldots$, on $e_1 + \ldots + e_{l-1}$ and e_l be subsequence of s (with appropriate ordering among the edges of the pairs and L and R added). Denote this subsequence of s by s^e, where the superscript e signifies that these reductions are essential in creating $f(d)$. Note that in order to be

able to do these reductions, it is also key that the edges we want to do the reduction on are present, that is, if $e_1 + \ldots + e_i$, $i \in [l]$, is an edge which is part of the reduction with an edge other than e_{i+1}, we must keep it in that reduction. Since the order of reductions is prescribed by $\mathcal{O}$ it follows that the edge $f(d)$ is an edge of a leaf of $R_G^{\mathcal{O}}$ if and only if s^e is a subsequence of the sequence of reductions leading to that leaf.

There cannot be a graph H' in $R_{G_2}^{\mathcal{O}}$ preceeding F_i (meaning that the path from G_2 to H' is to the left of the path from G_2 to F_i) such that s^e is a subsequence of the sequence of reductions leading from G to H', since then a descendent of H' would contain $f(d)$. We need to prove using this and that $b_G^{-1}(F_i)$ is not defined that there is also no graph H' in $R_{G_1}^{\mathcal{O}}$ such that s^e is a subsequence of the sequence of reductions leading from G to H'.

Since $b_G^{-1}(F_i)$ is not defined, it follows that s contains a reduction involving the edge b (other than (a, b, R)) and moreover, it also contains a reduction involving a b^*-edge e not derived from $a+b$ where that edge e is kept after the reduction is performed, thereby creating at least two b^*-edges not derived from $a + b$. Obviously, if any of the reductions involving b^*-edges are among s^e, then $f(d)$ cannot appear in $R_{G_1}^{\mathcal{O}}$. We argue that if none of the reductions involving b^*-edges are among s^e, then there is a graph H' in $R_{G_2}^{\mathcal{O}}$ preceeding F_i such that s^e is a subsequence of the sequence of reductions leading from G to H', which would contradict our assumption that $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_i}}$ attaches on exactly one facet to $(\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_{k+1}}} \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_{i-1}}})$ and on no lower dimensional face.

We now elaborate why under the above circumstances if none of the reductions involving b^*-edges not derived from $a + b$ are among s^e, then there is a graph H' in $R_{G_2}^{\mathcal{O}}$ preceeding F_i such that s^e is a subsequence of the sequence of reductions leading from G to H'. Since s contains a reduction involving the edge b (other than (a, b, R)) and it also contains a reduction involving a b^*-edge not derived from $a + b$ and where that edge is kept, it follows that for some edge x there is a reduction (x, b, R) in s and $x \neq e_1 + \cdots + e_i$, for any $i \in [l]$, or there is a reduction $(g(a + b), x, R)$ in s where $g(a + b)$ is an $(a + b)^*$-edge and $x \neq e_1 + \cdots + e_i$, for any $i \in [l]$, and this reduction is followed by a reduction $(f(b), x, L)$, where $f(b)$ is a b^*-edge not derived from $a + b$. However, if none of the reductions involving b^*-edges not derived from $a + b$ are among s^e, then there is a graph H' in $R_{G_2}^{\mathcal{O}}$ in the subtree to which we get if we do (x, b, L) instead of (x, b, R) or $(g(a + b), x, L)$ instead of $(g(a + b), x, R)$, such that s^e is a subsequence of the sequence of reductions leading from G to H'. □

4. Strong embeddability and a description of the leaves of $R_G^{\mathcal{O}}$

In this section we introduce *strong embeddability of reduction trees* and use it to give a description of all the leaves in $R_G^{\mathcal{O}}$. As we will see in in Sections 6 and 7 strong embeddability generalizes to other settings.

Theorem 5. *Let $F_1, \ldots, F_l$ be the full dimensional leaves of $R_G^{\mathcal{O}}$ in depth-first search order. Let*

$$P_i := \{\{Q_1^i, \ldots, Q_{f(i)}^i\}\} = \{\{F_i \cap F_j \mid 1 \leq j < i, |E(F_i \cap F_j)| = |E(F_i)| - 1\}\}.$$

Then

$$\sum_{i=1}^{l} \prod_{j=1}^{f(i)} (F_i + Q_j^i) \tag{9}$$

is the formal sum of the set of the leaves of $R_G^{\mathcal{O}}$, where the product of graphs is their intersection, and if $f(i) = 0$ then we define $\prod_{j=1}^{f(i)}(F_i + Q_j^i) = F_i$.

Note that with the notation of Theorem 5 and with Definition 6 in mind we have that

$$\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_i}} \cap (\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_1}} \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_{i-1}}}) = \mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{Q_1^i}} \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{Q_{f(i)}^i}},$$

where $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{Q_j^i}}$, $j \in [f(i)]$, is a facet of $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_i}}$. Indeed, this follows directly from Theorems 18 and Theorem 3.

Definition 16. Given a reduction tree R_G and a full dimensional leaf L of it, we say that a leaf H of R_G is a **preceeding facet** of L if

1. H is before L in the depth first search order of the leaves of R_G
2. $E(H) \subset E(L)$ and $|E(H)| = |E(L)| - 1$
3. the unique path in R_G from L to H consists of several up steps followed by several down steps, so that the first of the down steps is a Middle reduction.

Lemma 6. *Let $F_1, \ldots, F_l$ be full dimensional leaves of $R_G^{\mathcal{O}}$ in depth-first search order and let P_i be as in Theorem 5. Then the (multi)set of preceeding facets of F_i is equal to P_i.*

Before proving Lemma 6 we provide an auxiliary lemma that will come in handy in the proof.

Lemma 7. *Let F_i and F_j, with F_j preceeding F_i in depth-first search order, be two full dimensional leaves of $R_G^{\mathcal{O}}$ differing in only one edge; that is, $F_i \cap F_j = F_i - e$ for some edge e of F_i. Let the paths from G to F_j and from G to F_i split at graph H via the reduction (z, v), where we take (z, v, L) towards F_j and (z, v, R) towards F_i. Then:*

1. on the path from H to F_j when the edge z or a z^*-edge not derived from $z + v$ is used, then this z^*-edge is always dropped

2. on the path from H to F_i when the edge v or a v^*-edge not derived from $z + v$ is used, then this v^*-edge is always dropped

3. whenever on the path from H to F_j and H to F_i we have the same edges to do the reduction on, we go to the right or to the left on both paths

4. F_j has a unique z^*-edge not derived from $z + v$ denoted by $f(z)$ and F_i has a unique v^*-edge not derived from $z + v$ denoted by $f(v)$, and we have $F_j - f(z) = F_i - f(v)$

The proof of Lemma 7 can be seen by inspection and is left to the reader.

Proof of Lemma 6. We prove by induction on $\mathrm{dep}(G)$, which the the maximum length of a path in $R_G^{\mathcal{O}}$ from G to a leaf of $R_G^{\mathcal{O}}$, that P_i is the set of preceeding facets for F_i. Let G_1, G_2, G_3 be the left, right and middle children of G and let $F_1, \ldots, F_k$, and $F_{k+1}, \ldots, F_l$ and $Q_1, \ldots, Q_z$ be their full dimensional leaves for which the statement holds. Thus, the set of preceeding facets of F_i, $i \in [k]$, is P_i by inductive hypothesis. Assume that for some $k + 1 \leq i \leq l$ there is a preceeding facet H of F_i which is not in P_i. By the inductive hypothesis for G_2 and the definition of preceeding facet, H has to then be in $R_{G_3}^{\mathcal{O}}$. However, since $R_G^{\mathcal{O}}$ satisfies the weak embeddable property, we have that the only possible such facet is $b_G^{-1}(F_i)$, when this is well defined. However, using that $R_G^{\mathcal{O}}$ satisfies the twosided embeddable property, we can then show that there exists a full dimensional leaf in $R_{G_1}^{\mathcal{O}}$ which contains $b_G^{-1}(F_i)$, thereby showing that $b_G^{-1}(F_i)$ is in P_i. Thus all preceeding facets of F_i are in P_i.

Next we need to show that all elements of P_i are preceeding facets. First we observe that the elements of P_i, $k + 1 \leq i \leq l$, must be leaves of $R_G^{\mathcal{O}}$. Indeed, if we are considering an element $F_j \cap F_i \in P_i$ with $k + 1 \leq j < i$, then it is a leaf of $R_{G_2}^{\mathcal{O}}$ by inductive hypothesis. If $F_j \cap F_i \in P_i$ for $j < k + 1 \leq i$, then we have F_j in $R_{G_1}^{\mathcal{O}}$ and F_i in $R_{G_2}^{\mathcal{O}}$, and the two graphs differ by exactly one edge. However, with Lemma 7 we can see that then $F_j \cap F_i$ is in $R_{G_3}^{\mathcal{O}}$, since we can obtain it by going towards G_3 from G and then executing the operations as on the path to F_j or F_i. It is now clear that the elements of P_i satisfy conditions 1. and 2. in Definition 16. Assume that for some $k + 1 \leq i \leq l$ there is $H \in P_i$ which is not a preceeding facet. Thus, because of the inductive hypothesis we have that $H \in R_{G_1}^{\mathcal{O}}$. However, if H differs from F_i by only missing an edge, then it can be seen that the sequence of reductions used to obtain H from G vs the sequence of reductions used to obtain F_i from G is different in that somewhere we need to go towards M for H and towards R to F_i. Thus, H cannot belong to $R_{G_1}^{\mathcal{O}}$, completing the proof. □

Before proceeding to the proof of Theorem 5 we introduce the strong embeddable property which, as its name suggests it is an extension of the weak embeddable property. We then see that $R_G^{\mathcal{O}}$ has this property and use it to prove Theorem 5. The strong embeddable property will also be a basis for proofs of several nonnegativity results of reduced forms, including the proof of a conjecture of Kirillov.

Definition 17. Let R_G posses the weak embeddable property. At a non-leaf H of R_G let b_H be the bijection specified in 2 in Definition 10. The reduction tree R_G is said to have the (right) **strong embeddable property** if the following statements are true:

1. if $b_H(Q_i) = F_{i_j}$, so that $E(F_{i_j}) = E(Q_i) \cup \{e\}$, then if in R_{H_3} the preceeding facets of the full dimensional leaf Q_i are $Z_1, \ldots, Z_k$ (in the sense of Definition 16), then $Z_1 + e, \ldots, Z_k + e$ are preceeding facets of F_{i_j} in R_{H_2}
2. for F_{i_j} as in 1, there are no leaves in R_{H_2} which are preceeding facets of F_{i_j} other than $Z_1 + e, \ldots, Z_k + e$

Note, that if R_H possesses the weak embeddable property then for a full dimensional leaf L in R_H which is also in R_{H_2} there is exactly one preceeding facet of it belonging to R_{H_3} if L is in the image of b_H and otherwise there is no preceeding facet of it belonging to R_{H_3}.

Lemma 8. *The reduction tree $R_G^{\mathcal{O}}$ has the strong embeddable property.*

Proof idea. In light of Lemma 6 strong embeddability of $R_G^{\mathcal{O}}$ is equivalent to (10) as explained below. At a non-leaf H of $R_G^{\mathcal{O}}$ let b_H be the bijection specified in 2 in Definition 10. Let H_2 and H_3 be the right and middle children of H in $R_G^{\mathcal{O}}$. Let $F_{k+1}, \ldots, F_l$ be the full dimensional leaves of $R_{H_2}^{\mathcal{O}}$ and let $Q_1, \ldots, Q_z$ be the full dimensional leaves of $R_{H_3}^{\mathcal{O}}$. Let $b_H(Q_i) = F_{i_j}$, so that $E(F_{i_j}) = E(Q_i) \cup \{e_i\}$, $i \in [z]$.

For $k + 2 \leq i \leq l$, let

$$K_i = \{\{K_1^i, \ldots, K_{f(i)}^i\}\} = \{\{F_i \cap F_j \mid k+1 \leq j < i, |E(F_i \cap F_j)| = |E(F_i)| - 1\}\}.$$

For $1 \leq i \leq z$, let

$$Z_i = \{\{Z_1^i, \ldots, Z_{h(i)}^i\}\} = \{\{Q_i \cap Q_j \mid 1 \leq j < i, |E(Q_i \cap Q_j)| = |E(Q_i)| - 1\}\}.$$

Then we need to prove

$$\{\{K_1^{i_j}, \ldots, K_{f(i_j)}^{i_j}\}\} = \{\{Z_1^i + e_i, \ldots, Z_{h(i)}^i + e_i\}\}. \tag{10}$$

Proving (10) can be accomplished by proving $K_{i_j} \subset Z_i + e$ and $Z_i + e \subset K_{i_j}$ using case analysis and utilizing Lemma 7. □

Proof of Theorem 5. We prove that (9) is the formal sum of the set of the leaves of $R_G^{\mathcal{O}}$ by induction on $\deg(G)$. We know that $\sum_{i=1}^{k} \prod_{j=1}^{f(i)} (F_i + Q_j^i)$, $\sum_{i=k+1}^{l} \prod_{j=1}^{g(i)} (F_i + K_j^i)$, and $\sum_{i=1}^{z} \prod_{j=1}^{h(i)} (Q_i + Z_j^i)$ are the formal sums of the set of the leaves of $R_{G_1}^{\mathcal{O}}$, $R_{G_2}^{\mathcal{O}}$ and $R_{G_3}^{\mathcal{O}}$, respectively, where the notation is as would be expected based on the statement of Theorem 5. We know by strong embeddability and Lemma 6 that if $b_G^{-1}(F_i)$, $k+1 \leq i$, is not well-defined then $\{Q_j^i\}_{i=1}^{f(i)} = \{K_j^i\}_{i=1}^{g(i)}$ and if $b_G^{-1}(F_i)$ is well-defined then $\{Q_j^i\}_{i=1}^{f(i)} = \{K_j^i\}_{i=1}^{g(i)} \cup \{b_G^{-1}(F_i)\}$. But then

$$\sum_{i=1}^{l} \prod_{j=1}^{f(i)} (F_i + Q_j^i) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \prod_{j=1}^{f(i)} (F_i + Q_j^i) + \sum_{i=k+1}^{l} \prod_{j=1}^{g(i)} (F_i + K_j^i) + \sum_{i=k+1}^{l} \prod_{j=1}^{g(i)} \chi(b_G^{-1}(F_i))(F_i + K_j^i) b_G^{-1}(F_i), \tag{11}$$

where $\chi(b_G^{-1}(F_i))$ is 1 is $b_G^{-1}(F_i)$ is well-defined, and 0 otherwise. Note that

$$\sum_{i=k+1}^{l}\prod_{j=1}^{g(i)}\chi(b_G^{-1}(F_i))(F_i+K_j^i)b_G^{-1}(F_i)=\sum_{i=1}^{z}\prod_{j=1}^{g(b_G(i))}(b_G(Q_i)+K_j^{b_G(i)})Q_i, \tag{12}$$

where $b_G(i)$ is the index k of F_k to which $b_G(Q_i)$ is equal to.

The right hand side of (12) is equal to:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{z}\prod_{j=1}^{g(b_G(i))}((b_G(Q_i)\cap Q_i)+(K_j^{b_G(i)}\cap Q_i))=\sum_{i=1}^{z}\prod_{j=1}^{h(i)}(Q_i+Z_j^i), \tag{13}$$

where the last equality holds by equation (10) stated in the proof of the strong embeddable property of $R_G^{\mathcal{O}}$ in Lemma 8.

Equations (11), (12) and (13) then imply

$$\sum_{i=1}^{l}\prod_{j=1}^{f(i)}(F_i+Q_j^i)=\sum_{i=1}^{k}\prod_{j=1}^{f(i)}(F_i+Q_j^i)+\sum_{i=k+1}^{l}\prod_{j=1}^{g(i)}(F_i+K_j^i)+\sum_{i=1}^{z}\prod_{j=1}^{h(i)}(Q_i+Z_j^i), \tag{14}$$

completing the proof.

□

5. Refining h-vectors of the canonical triangulation of $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{G}}$

In this section we study a refinement of the h-polynomial of the canonical triangulation of flow polytopes.

Consider the reduction tree $R_G^{\mathcal{O}}$ and let F_i and Q_j^i be as in Theorem 5. By Theorem 5 each Q_j^i appears in the reduction tree $R_G^{\mathcal{O}}$, and we assign a **weight** $w(Q_j^i)=\beta_a$ to each Q_j^i, where the unique reduction on the path from G to Q_j^i where we go to the middle child is performed on the edges $(a,c),(c,d)$. By Theorem 5 all other not full dimensional simplices are obtained as intersections of a subset of the Q_j^is, and we weight those intersections by the product of the weights of the Q_j^i appearing in the intersection (note that this may or may not be the same as the product of β_i's associated to the sequence of reductions yielding the graph). Denote the weight of G by $w(G)$. We set the weight of full dimensional leaves to be 1. From what we just said, together with Theorem 5, it follows that:

Theorem 9. *Let $F_1,\ldots,F_l$ be full dimensional leaves of $R_G^{\mathcal{O}}$ in depth-first search order. Let*

$$P_i:=\{\{Q_1^i,\ldots,Q_{f(i)}^i\}\}=\{\{F_i\cap F_j\mid 1\leq j<i,|E(F_i\cap F_j)|=|E(F_i)|-1\}\}.$$

Then

$$\sum_{i=1}^{l}\prod_{j=1}^{f(i)}(F_i+w(Q_j^i)Q_j^i), \tag{15}$$

is the formal sum of the set of weighted leaves of $R_G^{\mathcal{O}}$, where the product of graphs is their intersection, and if $f(i)=0$ then we define $\prod_{j=1}^{f(i)}(F_i+w(Q_j^i)Q_j^i)=F_i$.

Let $\mathcal{C}$ be the abstract simplicial complex obtained from $R_G^{\mathcal{O}}$, as in Theorem 2. Recall that $h(\mathcal{C},\beta)=\sum_{i=0}^{d}h_i\beta^i$, where using the shelling from Theorem 3 we get that h_i is equal to the number of top dimensional simplices which attach on i facets to the union of previous simplices in

the shelling order. Equation (15) then suggests the following natural refinement of the h-vector of the canonical triangulation of $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{G}}$.

Definition 18. For the canonical triangulation of $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{G}}$ let the $h(\mathfrak{b})$-vector be the following refinement of the h-polynomial:

$$h(\mathcal{C},\mathfrak{b}) = \sum_{i=1}^{l}\prod_{j=1}^{f(i)} w(Q_j^i). \tag{16}$$

Clearly, setting all $\beta_i = \beta$ we have $h(\mathcal{C},\mathfrak{b}) = h(\mathcal{C},\beta)$. Thus, $h(\mathcal{C},\mathfrak{b})$ gives a refinement of the h-polynomial.

Theorem 10. *Let $Q_G^{\mathcal{O}}(\mathfrak{b};\mathbf{x})$ be the reduced form in the subdivision algebra $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{b})$ when we did the reductions in the specified order $\mathcal{O}$. Let $Q_G^{\mathcal{O}}(\mathfrak{b}-\mathbf{1})$ be the specialization of $Q_G^{\mathcal{O}}(\mathfrak{b}-\mathbf{1};\mathbf{x})$ at $\mathbf{x} = (1,\ldots,1)$. Then*

$$Q_G^{\mathcal{O}}(\mathfrak{b}-\mathbf{1}) = h(\mathcal{C},\mathfrak{b}). \tag{17}$$

In particular, $Q_G^{\mathcal{O}}(\mathfrak{b}-\mathbf{1})$ has nonnegative integer coefficients.

Proof. We prove (17) by induction on $\mathrm{dep}(G)$.

If $\mathrm{dep}(G) = 0$, then $Q_G^{\mathcal{O}}(\mathfrak{b}-\mathbf{1}) = 1$ and $h(\mathcal{C},\mathfrak{b}) = 1$, also.

Suppose (17) is true for all graphs G with $\mathrm{dep}(G) < m$. Consider the graph G with $\mathrm{dep}(G) = m > 0$. Since there is a pair of alternating edges in G we can perform a reduction on the edges (i,j) and (j,k), $i<j<k$, of G which come first in the order $\mathcal{O}$, obtaining the graphs G_1, G_2 and G_3, such that $\mathrm{dep}(G_1),\mathrm{dep}(G_2),\mathrm{dep}(G_3) < m$. It follows then by definition that

$$Q_G^{\mathcal{O}}(\mathfrak{b}) = Q_{G_1}^{\mathcal{O}}(\mathfrak{b}) + Q_{G_2}^{\mathcal{O}}(\mathfrak{b}) + \beta_i Q_{G_3}^{\mathcal{O}}(\mathfrak{b}). \tag{18}$$

Since $\mathrm{dep}(G_1),\mathrm{dep}(G_2),\mathrm{dep}(G_3) < m$, it follows by inductive hypothesis that $Q_{G_i}^{\mathcal{O}}(\mathfrak{b}-1) = h(\mathcal{C}_i,\mathfrak{b})$, $i\in[3]$, where $\mathcal{C}_i$ is the canonical triangulation of $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{G}}$ of $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{G_i}}$, $i\in[3]$. Next we show that

$$h(\mathcal{C},\mathfrak{b}) = h(\mathcal{C}_1,\mathfrak{b}) + h(\mathcal{C}_2,\mathfrak{b}) + (\beta_i-1)h(\mathcal{C}_3,\mathfrak{b}), \tag{19}$$

which will conclude the proof of (17).

Recall that by the definition of $h(\mathcal{C},\mathfrak{b})$, we look at the shelling order $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_1}},\ldots,\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_l}}$ we obtained from reading off the full dimensional leaves of $R_G^{\mathcal{O}}$ in depth-first search order. By Theorem 3 we have that $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_1}},\ldots,\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_f}}$ is a shelling of $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{G_1}}$ read off from $R_{G_1}^{\mathcal{O}}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_{f+1}}},\ldots,\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_l}}$ is a shelling of $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{G_2}}$ read off from $R_{G_2}^{\mathcal{O}}$. Let $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{L_1}},\ldots,\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{L_s}}$ be a shelling of $\mathcal{F}_{G_3}$ read off from $R_{G_3}^{\mathcal{O}}$ in the same fashion. Note that

$$h(\mathcal{C}_1,\mathfrak{b}) = \sum_{i=1}^{f}\prod_{j=1}^{f(i)} w(Q_j^i). \tag{20}$$

Next we show that

$$h(\mathcal{C}_2,\mathfrak{b}) + (\beta_i-1)h(\mathcal{C}_3,\mathfrak{b}) = \sum_{i=f+1}^{l}\prod_{j=1}^{f(i)} w(Q_j^i). \tag{21}$$

Equations (20) and (21) yield (19).

Call $\prod_{j=1}^{f(i)} w(Q_j^i)$ the weight contribution of simplex $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_i}}$ to the $h(\mathfrak{b})$-polynomial. Note that a simplex $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_i}}$, $i\in\{f+1,\ldots,l\}$, contributes the same weight to $h(\mathcal{C}_2,\mathfrak{b})$ and $h(\mathcal{C},\mathfrak{b})$ if and only if $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_i}} \cap (\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_1}} \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_f}}) = \emptyset$. On the other hand using the strong embeddable property of $R_G^{\mathcal{O}}$, the

weight contribution of all simplices $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_i}}$, $i \in \{f+1, \ldots, l\}$ such that $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_i}} \cap (\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_1}} \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{F_f}}) \neq \emptyset$ is equal to $h(\mathcal{C}_3, \mathfrak{b})$ in $h(\mathcal{C}_2, \mathfrak{b})$ and $\beta_i h(\mathcal{C}_3, \mathfrak{b})$ in $h(\mathcal{C}, \mathfrak{b})$, yielding (21). □

Theorem 10 yields an alternative proof to [10, Theorem 8]. Indeed, by [10, Lemma 5] we have that $Q_G^{\mathcal{O}}(\mathfrak{b} - \mathbf{1}) = Q_G(\beta - 1)$, when we set $\beta_i = \beta$. However, the initial proof of [10, Theorem 8] is simpler then the above, building on much less knowledge.

An interesting special case of Theorem 10 to consider is when G is the path graph $P_n = ([n], \{(i, i+1) | i \in [n-1]\})$. In this case the notion of weight $w(G)$ has an additional combinatorial interpretation. Before we proceed to state it, we note that the reduced form still depends on the order of reductions we use, and we keep to using the order $\mathcal{O}$ in the rest of this section. Indeed, in the order $\mathcal{O}$ the leaf of $R_{P_5}^{\mathcal{O}}$ labeled by the graph $([5], \{(1,5)\})$ is weighted by β_1^3, whereas if we first reduce the edges $(1,2)$ and $(2,3)$ and then the edges $(3,4)$ and $(4,5)$, then it would be weighted by $\beta_1^2 \beta_3$.

Given a leaf G, let $((i_a, j_a), (j_a, k_a), M)$, $a \in [p]$, be all the reductions on the path from P_n to G in $R_{P_n}^{\mathcal{O}}$ where we go towards the middle child. Define $b(G) = \prod_{a=1}^{p} \beta_{i_a}$ the **balance** of leaf G. The following theorem states that we can express $b(G)$ in terms of properties of G.

Theorem 11. *Given a leaf G of $R_{P_n}^{\mathcal{O}}$,*

$$b(G) = \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} \beta_i^{f_G(i)},$$

where $f_G(i)$ is equal to the number of (graph-)components of G such that the shortest edge e such that the component is entirely between the initial and end vertex of the edge e has initial vertex i.

Proof. We prove by induction on n that $b(G) = \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} \beta_i^{f_G(i)}$. The base case is trivial. Assume it is true for all P_m, $m < n$.

Consider P_n. Let $L_1, \ldots, L_k$ be the leaves of $R_{P_{n-1}}^{\mathcal{O}}$ in depth-first search order. By assumption, $b(L_j) = \prod_{i=1}^{n-2} \beta_i^{f_{L_j}(i)}$. Consider a leaf L of $R_{P_n}^{\mathcal{O}}$. Since the leaves of $R_{P_n}^{\mathcal{O}}$ are the leaves of $R_{L_1+(n-1,n)}^{\mathcal{O}}, \cdots, R_{L_k+(n-1,n)}^{\mathcal{O}}$, we can assume that L is a leaf of $R_{L_z+(n-1,n)}^{\mathcal{O}}$, $z \in [k]$. Then we have that

$$b_{P_n}(L) = b_{P_{n-1}}(L_z) \times b_{L_z+(n-1,n)}(L), \tag{22}$$

where we indexed b to clarify within which reduction tree we are. Combining (22) with the inductive hypothesis yields our desired result. □

Corollary 12. *Given a leaf G of $R_{P_n}^{\mathcal{O}}$ with $n-2$ edges,*

$$w(G) = \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} \beta_i^{f_G(i)},$$

where $f_G(i)$ is equal to the number of (graph-)components of G such that the shortest edge e such that the component is entirely between the initial and end vertex of the edge e has initial vertex i.

Proof. This is immediate, since for a leaf G with $n-2$ edges the weight $w(G)$ is defined to be equal to the balance $b(G)$. □

It appears to be true in general that if G is a leaf in $R_{P_n}^{\mathcal{O}}$, then $w(G) = b(G)$. We leave this investigation to the interested reader.

6. The weak and strong embeddable properties of partial reduction trees

In this section we define partial reduction trees and show how to extend the previous theorems to them. Reduction trees in the algebras $\widetilde{ACYB}_n(\beta)$ and $\widetilde{MACYB}_n(\mathfrak{b})$ can be considered as partial

reduction trees in the sense of this section, so the results presented below can be used for studying reduced forms in $\widetilde{ACYB}_n(\beta)$ and $M\widetilde{ACYB}_n(\mathfrak{b})$.

Definition 19. A **partial reduction tree** of the reduction tree R_G is a connected rooted (at G) subtree of R_G such that if a vertex has a left or middle or right child, then it has all three. We denote a partial reduction tree by R^p_G.

Definition 20. A partial reduction tree R^p_G is said to have the (right) **weak embeddable property** if one of the following is true for every vertex H of R^p_G:

1. H is a leaf of R^p_G
2. the middle child of H is H_3 and the right child of H is H_2, satisfying that there is a map b_H from the full dimensional leaves of the subtree $R^p_{H_3}$ of R^p_G (leaves with $|E(H_3)|$ number of edges) into the full dimensional leaves of the subtree $R^p_{H_2}$ (leaves with $|E(H_2)|$ number of edges) of R^p_G such that if $b_H(L) = L'$, then $E(L') = E(L) \cup \{e\}$ with $e \notin E(L)$. Moreover, if L' is a full dimensional leaf of $R^p_{H_2}$ such that there is a leaf L of $R^p_{H_3}$ with the property that $E(L') = E(L) \cup \{e\}$ with $e \notin E(L)$, then L is in the image of b_H and b_H is a bijection from the full dimensional leaves of $R^p_{H_3}$ onto its image. Moreover, there is a unique L in R_{H_3} such that $E(L') = E(L) \cup \{e\}$ with $e \notin E(L)$.

Definition 21. Given a partial reduction tree R^p_G and a full dimensional leaf L of it, we say that a leaf H of R^p_G is a **preceeding facet** of L if

1. H is before L in the depth first search order of the leaves of R^p_G
2. $E(H) \subset E(L)$ and $|E(H)| = |E(L)| - 1$
3. the unique path in R^p_G from L to H consists of several up steps followed by several down steps, so that the first of the down steps is a Middle reduction.

Definition 22. Let R^p_G posses the weak embeddable property. At a non-leaf H of R^p_G let b_H be the bijection specified in 2 in Definition 20. The partial reduction tree R^p_G is said to have the (right) **strong embeddable property** if the following statements are true:

1. if $b_H(Q_i) = F_{i_j}$, so that $E(F_{i_j}) = E(Q_i) \cup \{e\}$, then if in $R^p_{H_3}$ the preceeding facets of the full dimensional leaf Q_i are $Z_1, \ldots, Z_k$ (in the sense of Definition 21), then $Z_1 + e, \ldots, Z_k + e$ are preceeding facets of F_{i_j} in $R^p_{H_2}$
2. for F_{i_j} as in 1, there are no leaves in $R^p_{H_2}$ which are preceeding facets of F_{i_j} other than $Z_1 + e, \ldots, Z_k + e$

Note that if R^p_G possesses the weak embeddable property then for a full dimensional leaf L in R^p_H which is also in $R^p_{H_2}$ there is exactly one preceeding facet of it belonging to $R^p_{H_3}$ if L is in the image of b_H and otherwise there is no preceeding facet of it belonging to $R^p_{H_3}$.

Definition 23. Given a partial reduction tree R^p_G with the strong embeddable property define the $h(\mathfrak{b})$-polynomial for it as follows:

$$h(R^p_G, \mathfrak{b}) = \sum_L p(L), \tag{23}$$

where the sum runs over all full dimensional leaves L of R^p_G and $p(L) = \prod_F w(F)$, where the product is over the preceeding facets F of L and $w(F)$ is the weight of F as defined in Section 5. The empty product is defined to be equal to 1.

If we specialize by setting $\beta_i = \beta$ for all $i \in [n]$, then we get

$$h(R^p_G, \beta) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} s_i \beta^i, \tag{24}$$

where s_i is the number of full dimensional leaves L of R^p_G such that there are exactly i preceeding facets of it.

Note that if we take R_G^p to be the reduction tree $R_G^{\mathcal{O}}$ then the $h(\mathfrak{b})$-polynomial in (29) agrees with the $h(\mathfrak{b})$-polynomial from Definition 18 and specializes to the usual h-polynomial.

The following result is a culmination of the insight of the above definitions. It generalizes Theorem 10 and [10, Theorem 8].

Theorem 13. *Given a partial reduction tree R_G^p with the strong embeddable property we have that*

$$Q_G^p(\mathfrak{b}-1) = h(R_G^p, \mathfrak{b}), \tag{25}$$

where $Q_G^p(\mathfrak{b};\mathbf{x}) = \sum_L \mathbf{x}(L)\mathfrak{b}(L)$, where the sum is over all leaves of R_G^p, $\mathbf{x}(L) = \prod_{(i,j)\in L} x_{ij}$ and $\mathfrak{b}(L) = \prod_{j=1}^{z} \beta_{i_j}$, where on the path from G to L we went towards the middle z times, and the reductions where we went towards the middle had the minimal vertex of the first edge be $i_1, \ldots, i_z$. We denote $Q_G^p(\mathfrak{b}-1) = Q_G^p(\mathfrak{b}-1;\mathbf{1})$.

Proof. We prove Theorem 13 by induction on $\mathrm{dep}(G)$. Since R_G^p has the strong embeddable property, so do $R_{G_1}^p$, $R_{G_2}^p$ and $R_{G_3}^p$, where G_1, G_2, G_3 are as in (1) after we performed reduction on the edges (i,j) and (j,k) of G. By definition,

$$Q_G^p(\mathfrak{b}) = Q_{G_1}^p(\mathfrak{b}) + Q_{G_2}^p(\mathfrak{b}) + \beta_i Q_{G_3}^p(\mathfrak{b}), \tag{26}$$

thus to prove (25) we need to prove that

$$h(R_G^p, \mathfrak{b}) = h(R_{G_1}^p, \mathfrak{b}) + h(R_{G_2}^p, \mathfrak{b}) + (\beta_i - 1)h(R_{G_3}^p, \mathfrak{b}), \tag{27}$$

holds, since by induction $Q_{G_i}^p(\mathfrak{b}-1) = h(R_{G_i}^p, \mathfrak{b})$, for $i \in [3]$. Equation (27) follows by definition, since the strong embeddable property ensures that the contribution of $R_{G_1}^p$ to $h(R_G^p, \mathfrak{b})$ is exactly $h(R_{G_1}^p, \mathfrak{b})$ and the contribution of $R_{G_2}^p$ to $h(R_G^p, \mathfrak{b})$ is exactly $h(R_{G_2}^p, \mathfrak{b}) + (\beta_i - 1)h(R_{G_3}^p, \mathfrak{b})$, as explained in the following. The full dimensional leaves of $R_{G_2}^p$ which are not in the image of the map b_G contribute $h(R_{G_2}^p, \mathfrak{b}) - h(R_{G_3}^p, \mathfrak{b})$ to $h(R_G^p, \mathfrak{b})$ and full dimensional leaves of $R_{G_2}^p$ which are in the image of b_G contribute $\beta_i h(R_{G_3}^p, \mathfrak{b})$ to $h(R_G^p, \mathfrak{b})$, where we multiply by β_i since if a full dimensional leaves of $R_{G_2}^p$ is in the image of b_G, then other than the preceeding facets of it in $R_{G_2}^p$, it has one additional preceeding facet, namely its preimage under b_G. □

7. Solving Kirillov's Conjecture 7

In this section we use the techniques developed in Section 6 to prove [5, Conjecture 7] for a special family of reduction trees, namely those which posses the extra strong embeddable property. We also demonstrate via counterexamples that [5, Conjecture 7] fails in general. We recall the conjecture here for convenience.

Definition 24. Given a graph G on the vertex set $[n]$, denote by $Q_G^{\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{b})}(\mathfrak{b}, t)$ the specialization of a particular reduced form $Q_G^{\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{b})}(\mathfrak{b}, \mathbf{x})$ when $x_{ij} = 1$, if $(i,j) \neq (1,n)$, and $x_{1,n} = t$. The polynomial $Q_G^{\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{b})}(\mathfrak{b}, t)$ depends on the order of reductions performed. If we set $\beta_i = \beta$ for all $i \in [n-2]$, then we denote $Q_G^{\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{b})}(\mathfrak{b}, t)$ by $Q_G^{\mathcal{S}(\beta)}(\beta, t)$.

Conjecture 14. [5, Conjecture 7 (A)] *Let $n \geq 4$ and write*

$$Q_{K_n}^{\mathcal{S}(\beta)}(\beta, t) = \sum_{k=0}^{2n-6} (1+\beta)^k c_{k,n}(t). \tag{28}$$

Then $c_{k,n}(t) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}[t]$.

Note that since the reduced forms $Q_G^{\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{b})}(\mathfrak{b}, t)$ and $Q_G^{\mathcal{S}(\beta)}(\beta, t)$ depend on the order of reductions performed, not just on the initial monomial determined by G, Kirillov's conjectures says that for any particular reduced form there is an expansion of the given form.

Definition 25. Given a partial reduction tree R_G^p with the strong embeddable property define the generalized $h(\mathfrak{b},t)$-polynomial for it as follows:

$$h(R_G^p,\mathfrak{b},t)=\sum_L p(L,t), \tag{29}$$

where the sum runs over all full dimensional leaves L of R_G^p and $p(L,t)=w_t(L)\prod_F w(F)$, where the product is over the preceeding facets F of L and $w_t(L)=t^l$ if L has exactly l edges $(1,n)$. The empty product is defined to be equal to 1.

Definition 26. A partial reduction tree R_G^p is said to have the **extra strong embeddable property** if it has the strong embeddable property and in addition for every non-leaf vertex H the map b_H maps a graphs with a given number of edges $(1,n)$ to graphs with the same number of edges $(1,n)$.

The following result is a culmination of the insight of the above definitions.

Theorem 15. *Given a partial reduction tree R_G^p with the extra strong embeddable property we have that*

$$Q_G^p(\mathfrak{b}-1,t)=h(R_G^p,\mathfrak{b},t). \tag{30}$$

Proof. We prove Theorem 15 by induction on $\mathrm{dep}(G)$. Since R_G^p has the strong embeddable property, so do $R_{G_1}^p$, $R_{G_2}^p$ and $R_{G_3}^p$, where G_1,G_2,G_3 are as in (1) after we performed reduction on the edges (i,j) and (j,k) of G. By definition,

$$Q_G^p(\mathfrak{b},t)=Q_{G_1}^p(\mathfrak{b},t)+Q_{G_2}^p(\mathfrak{b},t)+\beta_i Q_{G_3}^p(\mathfrak{b},t), \tag{31}$$

thus to prove (30) we need to prove that

$$h(R_G^p,\mathfrak{b},t)=h(R_{G_1}^p,\mathfrak{b},t)+h(R_{G_2}^p,\mathfrak{b},t)+(\beta_i-1)h(R_{G_3}^p,\mathfrak{b},t), \tag{32}$$

holds, since by induction $Q_{G_i}^p(\mathfrak{b}-1,t)=h(R_{G_i}^p,\mathfrak{b},t)$, for $i\in[3]$. Equation (13) follows by definition, since the extra strong embeddable property ensures that the contribution of $R_{G_1}^p$ to $h(R_G^p,\mathfrak{b},t)$ is exactly $h(R_{G_1}^p,\mathfrak{b},t)$ and the contribution of $R_{G_2}^p$ to $h(R_G^p,\mathfrak{b},t)$ is exactly $h(R_{G_2}^p,\mathfrak{b},t)+(\beta_i-1)h(R_{G_3}^p,\mathfrak{b},t)$, as explained in the following. The full dimensional leaves of $R_{G_2}^p$ which are not in the image of the map b_G contribute $h(R_{G_2}^p,\mathfrak{b},t)-h(R_{G_3}^p,\mathfrak{b},t)$ to $h(R_G^p,\mathfrak{b},t)$ and full dimensional leaves of $R_{G_2}^p$ which are in the image of b_G contribute $\beta_i h(R_{G_3}^p,\mathfrak{b},t)$ to $h(R_G^p,\mathfrak{b},t)$, where we multiply by β_i since if a full dimensional leaves of $R_{G_2}^p$ is in the image of b_G, then other than the preceeding facets of it in $R_{G_2}^p$, it has one additional preceeding facet, namely its preimage under b_G. □

Theorem 16. *Suppose that the reduced form $Q_G^{\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{b})}(\mathfrak{b},t)$ was obtained through a reduction tree with the extra strong embeddable property and write*

$$Q_G^{\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{b})}(\mathfrak{b}-1,t)=\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\sum_{I:|I|=k}p(I)c_I(t), \tag{33}$$

where the sum is over all multisets I with elements in $[n-2]$ and with cardinality k, and $p_k(I)=\prod_{i\in I}\beta_i$. Then $c_I(t)\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}[t]$. Thus, [5, Conjecture 7 (A)] *holds for any graph (not just complete) if the corresponding reduction tree has the extra strong embeddable property.*

Proof. By Theorem 15 we have that $Q_G^{\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{b})}(\mathfrak{b}-1,t)=h(R_G,\mathfrak{b},t)$, where R_G is a reduction tree with the extra strong embeddable property. Together with Definition 25 this implies the statement of Theorem 16 immediately. □



FIGURE 3. A reduction tree of the complete graph K_4. The label $ijkX$ at a node, where $1 \leq i < j < k \leq 4$ and $X \in \{L, M, R\}$, specifies that the graph with this label was obtained by performing reduction $((i, j), (j, k), X)$ on its parent. When $ijkX$ is in boldface, it indicates that the corresponding graph is alternating. For this particular reduction tree we have $Q_G^{\mathcal{S}(\beta)}(\beta - 1, t) = \beta^0 t^4 + \beta^1(-t^2 + 4t^3 + 2t^4) + \beta^2(t^2 + 2t^3 + t^4)$, contradicting [5, Conjecture 7 (A)].

Since Theorem 16 proves [5, Conjecture 7 (A)] only if the reduction tree has the extra strong embeddable property, it raises the question of what happens otherwise. In Figure 3 we present the smallest counterexample to [5, Conjecture 7 (A)]. As can be seen the reduction tree in Figure 3 does not have the extra strong embeddable property. This counterexample was constructed by a program kindly written by Leonid Chindelevitch. The same program found many other counterexamples to [5, Conjecture 7 (A)].

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author is grateful to Leonid Chindelevitch for his interest, time and effort invested in writing the program which found the counterexample appearing in Section 7. The author thanks Federico Ardila, Louis Billera and Ed Swartz for several inspiring discussions regarding this work. The author also thanks Alejandro H. Morales for many interesting conversations about flow polytopes over the course of the years.

8. Appendix

The purpose of this section is to provide a proof of Theorem 2 as well as several auxiliary results used in the text. While we found it easier to define flow polytopes $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{G}}$ in Definition 6 as a convex hull of vertices, in this section we will prefer their definition as intersection of halfspaces. As such, we now proceed to introduce some new notation and then prove Theorem 2.

Definition 27. Fix a graph G on the vertex set $[n+1]$. Fix an order on the edges of the complete graph K_{n+1}: $e_1, \ldots, e_{\binom{n+1}{2}}$. Let $x_1, \ldots, x_k$ be the set of **base variables**, by which we mean a set of variables in which everything will be expressed. Let $\mathbf{c} = (c_1, c_2, \ldots)$ be an infinite vector with finitely many nonzero entries whose coordinates c_i, $i \in [m]$, satisfy the following two properties:

- c_i, $i \in [m]$, is a linear combination of the base variables,
- $c_i = 0$, if $i = a\binom{n+1}{2} + b$, $0 < b \leq \binom{n+1}{2}$, and the multiplicity of edge e_b is less than $a+1$ in G.

In other words, we think of the ith coordinate c_i of $\mathbf{c}$ as corresponding to a possible edge in G, namely to the $(a+1)$st edge e_b, if $i = a\binom{n+1}{2} + b$, $0 < b \leq \binom{n+1}{2}$. Then, the above requirements say that if an edge is not in G, then set the corresponding variable to 0, and otherwise to a linear combination of the base variables. Given an edge $e = (i, j)$ in G, we also write $c(e)$ for the corresponding variable in $\mathbf{c}$. Namely, if $(i, j) = e_b$ in the ordering of the edges of K_{n+1} and e is the $(a+1)st$ edge (i, j) in G, then $c(e) = c_{a\binom{n+1}{2}+b}$.

Definition 28. The **flow polytope** $\mathcal{F}_G(\mathbf{c})$ (with base variables $x_1, \ldots, x_k$) is defined as $x_i \geq 0$, $i \in k$, $c_i \geq 0$, $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, and

$$1 = \sum_{e \in E(G), \text{in}(e)=1} c(e) = \sum_{e \in E(G), \text{fin}(e)=n+1} c(e),$$

and for $2 \leq i \leq n$

$$\sum_{e \in E(G), \text{fin}(e)=i} c(e) = \sum_{e \in E(G), \text{in}(e)=i} c(e).$$

Note that if we order the multiset of edges $E(G) = \{\{e_1, \ldots, e_l\}\}$ and take variables x_{e_i}, $i \in [l]$, to be the base variables in Definition 27, and let $c(e_i) = x_{e_i}$, $i \in [l]$, then $\mathcal{F}_G(\mathbf{c})$ of Definition 27 is the usual way to define flow polytopes $\mathcal{F}_G$.

Recall that given a graph G on the vertex set $[n+1]$ containing edges (i, j) and (j, k), $i < j < k$, performing the **reduction** on these edges of G yields three graphs on the vertex set $[n+1]$:

$$\begin{aligned} E(G_1) &= E(G) \backslash \{(j,k)\} \cup \{(i,k)\}, \\ E(G_2) &= E(G) \backslash \{(i,j)\} \cup \{(i,k)\}, \\ E(G_3) &= E(G) \backslash \{(i,j),(j,k)\} \cup \{(i,k)\}. \end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

Suppose that the edge (i, j) of G involved in the reduction is the dth among the edges $(i, j) \in E(G)$, the edge (j, k) of G involved in the reduction is the fth among the edges $(j, k) \in E(G)$ and there are $a \geq 0$ edges (i, k) present in the graph G. Consider the flow polytope $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{G}}[\mathbf{c}]$ as in Definition 27. Define $\mathbf{c}^{G_1}, \mathbf{c}^{G_2}, \mathbf{c}^{G_3}$ to agree with $\mathbf{c}$ on all coordinates except on the coordinates corresponding to the dth edge (i, j), fth edge (j, k) and $(a+1)$st edge (i, k). Call these edges g_1, g_2, g_3 for simplicity. Then, when $c(g_1) \geq c(g_2)$ we can write $c^{G_1}(g_1) = c(g_1) - c(g_2)$, $c^{G_1}(g_2) = 0$, $c^{G_1}(g_3) = c(g_2)$. When $c(g_2) \geq c(g_1)$ we can write $c^{G_2}(g_1) = 0$, $c^{G_2}(g_2) = c(g_2) - c(g_1)$, $c^{G_2}(g_3) = c(g_1)$. Finally, when $c(g_1) = c(g_2)$ we can write $c^{G_3}(g_1) = 0$, $c^{G_3}(g_2) = 0$, $c^{G_1}(g_3) = c(g_1) = c(g_2)$. At times if clarity requires we denote $\mathbf{c}^{G_1}, \mathbf{c}^{G_2}, \mathbf{c}^{G_3}$ by $\mathbf{c}^{G_1,G}, \mathbf{c}^{G_2,G}, \mathbf{c}^{G_3,G}$ to emphasize that the reduction tree is rooted at G and the base variables correspond to the edges of G.

Using the above, we can restate Lemma 1 as follows; only our notation has changed.

Lemma 17. [7, Proposition 1],[11, Proposition 4.1], [12, 13] *Given a graph G on the vertex set $[n+1]$ and $(i,j),(j,k) \in E(G)$, for some $i<j<k$, we have*

$$\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{G}}(\mathbf{c}) = \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{G}_1}(\mathbf{c}^{G_1}) \bigcup \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{G}_2}(\mathbf{c}^{G_2}), \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{G}_1}(\mathbf{c}^{G_1}) \bigcap \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{G}_2}(\mathbf{c}^{G_2}) = \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{G}_3}(\mathbf{c}^{G_3}) \text{ and } \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{G}_1}(\mathbf{c}^{G_1})^\circ \bigcap \mathcal{F}^\circ_{\tilde{G}_2}(\mathbf{c}^{G_2}) = \emptyset,$$

where $\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{G}}(\mathbf{c})$, $\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{G}_1}(\mathbf{c}^{G_1})$, $\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{G}_2}(\mathbf{c}^{G_2})$ are of the same dimension $d-1$, $\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{G}_3}(\mathbf{c}^{G_3})$ is $d-2$ dimensional, and $\mathcal{P}^\circ$ denotes the interior of $\mathcal{P}$.

Definition 29. Let H be a graph labeling a node of the reduction tree R_G. Let the unique path from G to H be (in terms of the graphs on the nodes) $G - I_1 - \cdots - I_p - H$. Definition 2 constructs $\mathbf{c}^{I_1,G}$. Successively applying the rules given in Definition 2, while keeping the base variables those corresponding to the edges of G, we obtain the vector $\mathbf{c}^{H,G}$.

Intersection of flow polytopes as intersection of graphs. We show that if we use the special order $\mathcal{O}$ to reduce the graphs we consider, then in a sense (made precise below) we can think of intersections of two flow polytopes as intersection of graphs. Such a property is in general unexpected, and highlights the special choice of our reduction order $\mathcal{O}$.

Definition 30. Given vectors $\mathbf{c}^{G_1,G}$ and $\mathbf{c}^{G_2,G}$ as in Definition 29, we define vector $\mathbf{c}_{G_1 \cap G_2,G}$ as follows. Considering $\mathbf{c}^{G_1,G}$ and $\mathbf{c}^{G_2,G}$ as vectors expressed in the variables $x_1,\ldots,x_k$ satisfying constraints as in Definition 29, let $\mathbf{c}_{G_1\cap G_2,G}$ be the vector we obtain if we require additionally that $\mathbf{c}^{G_1,G} = \mathbf{c}^{G_2,G}$, putting additional constraints on the variables $x_1,\ldots,x_k$. That is, treating each coordinate $(\mathbf{c}^{G_1,G})_i$,$(\mathbf{c}^{G_2,G})_i$, $i \geq 1$, as an expression in $x_1,\ldots,x_k$, let C be the set of conditions on $x_1,\ldots,x_k$ from Definition 29 arising because of the vectors $\mathbf{c}^{G_1,G}$ and $\mathbf{c}^{G_2,G}$ together with the conditions $(\mathbf{c}^{G_1,G})_i = (\mathbf{c}^{G_2,G})_i$, $i \geq 1$. Then $(\mathbf{c}_{G_1\cap G_2,G})_i = (\mathbf{c}^{G_1,G})_i|_C$, where $(\mathbf{c}^{G_1,G})_i|_C$ is equal to $(\mathbf{c}^{G_1,G})_i$ with the conditions C satisfied.

The purpose of Definition 30 is to express the intersection of two flow polytopes corresponding to leaves G_1 and G_2 of $R^{\mathcal{O}}_G$, as stated in the following theorem.

Theorem 18. *Let G_1 and G_2 be two leaves of $R^{\mathcal{O}}_G$. Then*

$$\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{G_1}}(\mathbf{c}^{G_1,G}) \cap \mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{G_2}}(\mathbf{c}^{G_2,G}) = \mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{G_1 \cap G_2}}(\mathbf{c}_{G_1\cap G_2,G}). \tag{35}$$

Moreover, if $G_1 \cap G_2$ is in $R^{\mathcal{O}}_G$, then $\mathbf{c}^{G_1\cap G_2,G} = \mathbf{c}_{G_1\cap G_2,G}$. (Note that $G_1 \cap G_2$ need not be in $R^{\mathcal{O}}_G$.)

Before proving Theorem 18 we need to provide several auxiliary results.

Theorem 19. *If G_1 and G_2 are leaves of $R^{\mathcal{O}}_G$, then the vector $\mathbf{c}_{G_1\cap G_2,G}$ can be obtained from $\mathbf{c}^{G_1,G}$ by setting $c^{G_1,G}(e) = 0$ for all $e \notin G_1 \cap G_2$. In other words, the conditions on the base variables posed by $\mathbf{c}^{G_1,G}$ and $c^{G_1,G}(e) = 0$ for all $e \notin G_1 \cap G_2$ are equivalent to the conditions on the base variables posed by $\mathbf{c}^{G_2,G}$ and $c^{G_2,G}(e) = 0$ for all $e \notin G_1 \cap G_2$ and both of these are equivalent to the conditions on the base variables posed by $\mathbf{c}^{G_1,G}$ and $\mathbf{c}^{G_2,G}$ together with the conditions $(\mathbf{c}^{G_1,G})_i = (\mathbf{c}^{G_2,G})_i$, $i \geq 1$.*

Before proceeding to the proof of Theorem 19, we prove the following special case of it:

Proposition 20. *Theorem 19 holds for graphs G with the property that there exists a vertex $v \in V(G)$ such that all edges of G are incident to v and v has $k > 0$ incoming edges and one outgoing edge.*

Proof. We prove Proposition 20 by induction on k. When $k = 1$, it is trivial to check the statement. Assume the statement is true for all $m < k$. Let G be a graph with k incoming edges into v and one outgoing edge. Let e be the outgoing edge and e' be the lowest incoming edge into v. Consider $G' = G - e'$. By the inductive hypothesis the statement of Proposition 20 holds for it. Let $F_1,\ldots,F_k$ be the full dimensional leafs of $R^{\mathcal{O}}_{G'}$ in depth-first search order. Note that since e' was the lowest edge

and we are doing reduction in order $\mathcal{O}$, it follows that the reduction tree of G can be obtained from the reduction tree of G' by adding the edge e' to the leaves of $R^{\mathcal{O}}_{G'}$ and reducing where necessary. It is easy to see that there is only one leaf of $R^{\mathcal{O}}_{G'}$, namely F_k, where adding the edge e' makes the leaf a nonalternating graph. Let the leaves of $R^{\mathcal{O}}_{F_k}$ be F'_k, Q' and F'_{k+1} in depth-first search order. Now consider two leaves G_1 and G_2 of $R^{\mathcal{O}}_G$. If $G_1, G_2 \notin \{F'_k, F'_{k+1}, Q'\}$ then $G_1 - e'$ and $G_2 - e'$ are leaves of $R^{\mathcal{O}}_{G'}$ and we can conclude the statement of Theorem 19 for them by inductive hypothesis. If $G_1, G_2 \in \{F'_k, F'_{k+1}, Q'\}$, then it is easy to check the statement of Theorem 19 for them directly (since we can effectively consider F_k as the root of the reduction tree). Finally, if $G_1 \notin \{F'_k, F'_{k+1}, Q'\}$ and $G_2 \in \{F'_k, F'_{k+1}, Q'\}$ we consider the three cases depending on whether $G_2 = F'_k, G_2 = F'_{k+1}$ or $G_2 = Q'$. In all three cases it suffices to remember that the edge we obtain from performing the reduction on e' and e is not part of any leaf of $R^{\mathcal{O}}_G$ other than F'_k, F'_{k+1}, Q', and that e' is an edge of all the other leaves of $R^{\mathcal{O}}_G$. Using these two facts and that F'_k, F'_{k+1}, Q' are the children of F_k, the statements can be derived readily from the fact that the statement of Proposition 20 holds for $G_1 - e'$ and F_k.

□

Proof of Theorem 19. We prove Theorem 19 by induction on $\mathrm{dep}(G)$.

Base of induction. $\mathrm{dep}(G) = 0$. In this case $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{G}}$ is a simplex and the statement is trivial.

Inductive hypothesis. Statement true for all G, $\mathrm{dep}(G) < m$, $m > 0$.

Inductive step. Consider G with $\mathrm{dep}(G) = m$. Look at the last vertex v of G which is nonalternating. Let e be the lowest edge outgoing from v. Then $\mathrm{dep}(G - e) < m$, so the statement is true for it. From here we will prove that it is also true for G.

Let G_1 and G_2 be two leaves of $R^{\mathcal{O}}_{G-e}$. By the inductive hypothesis Theorem 19 holds for them. Consider two leaves H_1 and H_2 of $R^{\mathcal{O}}_G$. There are two possible cases:

Case 1. H_1 and H_2 are leaves of $R^{\mathcal{O}}_{G_1+e}$, where G_1 is a leaf of $R^{\mathcal{O}}_{G-e}$.

Case 2. H_1 and H_2 are leaves of $R^{\mathcal{O}}_{G_1+e}$ and $R^{\mathcal{O}}_{G_2+e}$, respectively, where G_1 and G_2 are distinct leaves of $R^{\mathcal{O}}_{G-e}$.

In Case 1, we can use coordinates $\mathbf{c}^{H_1,G_1+e}$ and $\mathbf{c}^{H_2,G_1+e}$, since whatever functions of the original edges of $G - e$ the base variables corresponding to the edges of G_1 are, the combinations remain untouched as we proceed with reductions in $R^{\mathcal{O}}_{G_1+e}$. Since G_1 is a leaf of $R^{\mathcal{O}}_{G-e}$, either $G_1 + e$ is alternating, in which case we are done, or it has exactly one nonalternating vertex v with one outgoing edge e and some incoming edges $e_1, \ldots, e_k$, $k \geq 1$. In this case we can use Proposition 20 directly to prove that Theorem 19 holds for H_1 and H_2.

In Case 2 we need to consider cases based on whether $G_1 + e$ and $G_2 + e$ are both alternating, both nonalternating, or one is alternating and one is nonalternating. In all these subcases, the statement of Theorem 19 for H_1 and H_2 follows from Proposition 20 together with the fact that we distinguish edges (i, j) based on how they were obtained as explained in Definition 4 – that is, if an edge (i, j) was obtained by doing a reduction on two edges e_1 and e_2 and another edge (i, j) was obtained by doing a reduction on two edges e_3 and e_4 with $\{e_1, e_2\} \neq \{e_3, e_4\}$, then these two edges (i, j) are considered different, and the vectors $\mathbf{c}$ take this into account. □

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 18.

Proof of Theorem 18. By the definition of $\mathbf{c}_{G_1 \cap G_2, G}$ it follows that

$$\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{G_1 \cap G_2}}(\mathbf{c}_{G_1 \cap G_2, G}) \subset \mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{G_1}}(\mathbf{c}^{G_1, G}) \cap \mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{G_2}}(\mathbf{c}^{G_2, G}). \tag{36}$$

To show

$$\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{G_1}}(\mathbf{c}^{G_1, G}) \cap \mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{G_2}}(\mathbf{c}^{G_2, G}) \subset \mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{G_1 \cap G_2}}(\mathbf{c}_{G_1 \cap G_2, G}) \tag{37}$$

consider a point $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{G_1}}(\mathbf{c}^{G_1,G}) \cap \mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{G_2}}(\mathbf{c}^{G_2,G})$. Since $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{G_1}}(\mathbf{c}^{G_1,G})$, it follows that all nonzero coordinates of $\mathbf{p}$ lie on the edges of G_1 and since $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{G_2}}(\mathbf{c}^{G_2,G})$, all nonzero coordinates of $\mathbf{p}$ lie on the edges of G_2. Thinking of the coordinates of $\mathbf{p}$ as corresponding to edges and expressing it with respect to the base variables corresponding to the edges of $\widetilde{G}$, we can conclude that $\mathbf{p}$ is a particular evaluation of the variable coordinate vector $\mathbf{c}^{G_1,G}$ with the constraint that $\mathbf{c}^{G_1,G}(e) = 0$ for all $e \notin G_1$. Similarly, $\mathbf{p}$ is a particular evaluation of the variable coordinate vector $\mathbf{c}^{G_2,G}$ with the constraint that $\mathbf{c}^{G_2,G}(e) = 0$ for all $e \notin G_2$. Thus, using the meaning given to $\mathbf{c}_{G_1\cap G_2,G}$ in Theorem 19, equation (37) follows.

Next we note that if for two leaves G_1 and G_2 of $R_G^{\mathcal{O}}$ the intersection $G_1 \cap G_2$ is also in $R_G^{\mathcal{O}}$, then the sequence of reductions used to obtain $G_1 \cap G_2$ can be obtained from the sequence of reductions used to obtain G_1 by going towards the middle in some of the reductions and accordingly deleting some followng reductions. It follows that $\mathbf{c}^{G_1\cap G_2,G}$ can be obtained from $\mathbf{c}^{G_1,G}$ by setting $c^{G_1,G}(e) = 0$ for all $e \notin G_1 \cap G_2$. Therefore, by Theorem 19 we have that $\mathbf{c}^{G_1\cap G_2,G} = \mathbf{c}_{G_1\cap G_2,G}$. □

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 2. For convenience we repeat its statement here.

Theorem 2. *The simplices corresponding to the full dimensional leaves of $R_G^{\mathcal{O}}$ induce a triangulation; that is, the intersection of any two of them is a face of both. Moreover, the simplices corresponding to all leaves of $R_G^{\mathcal{O}}$ are part of this triangulation.*

Proof. By Theorem 18 the intersection $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{G_1}}(\mathbf{c}^{G_1,G}) \cap \mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{G_2}}(\mathbf{c}^{G_2,G})$ is $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{G_1\cap G_2}}(\mathbf{c}_{G_1\cap G_2,G})$. It follows readily from Theorem 19 that $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{G_1\cap G_2}}(\mathbf{c}_{G_1\cap G_2,G})$ is a face of both $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{G_1}}(\mathbf{c}^{G_1,G})$ and $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{G_2}}(\mathbf{c}^{G_2,G})$. □

The following lemma is important for determining the dimension of $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{G_1\cap G_2}}(\mathbf{c}_{G_1\cap G_2,G})$ using Theorem 18.

Lemma 21. *As polynomials in the base variables corresponding to the edges of G, $\mathbf{c}_{G_1\cap G_2,G}(e)$ for $e \in G_1 \cap G_2$ are linearly independent.*

Proof. By Theorem 19, $\mathbf{c}_{G_1\cap G_2,G} = \mathbf{c}^{G_1,G}$ subject to the constraints $c^{G_1,G}(e) = 0$ for all $e \notin G_1 \cap G_2$. We claim that the coordinate polynomials in $\mathbf{c}^{G_1,G}$ corresponding to the edges of G_1 are linearly independent. This would imply that $\mathbf{c}_{G_1\cap G_2,G}(e)$ for $e \in G_1 \cap G_2$ are also linearly independent.

To see that the coordinate polynomials in $\mathbf{c}^{G_1,G}$ corresponding to the edges of G_1 are linearly independent observe that this is true of $\mathbf{c}^{G,G}$, which basically says that the base variables corresponding to the edges of G are distinct. Looking at the path in $\mathbb{R}_G^{\mathcal{O}}$ from G to G_1 we can prove the claim by induction on dep. Observe that in each step we take a pair of coordinate polynomials (p_1, p_2) and replace them by either $(p_1, p_2 - p_1)$, $(p_2, p_1 - p_2)$ or by a single polynomial p_1. Clearly then the resulting coordinate polynomials are still linearly independent. □

Corollary 22. *The dimension of $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{G_1\cap G_2}}(\mathbf{c}_{G_1\cap G_2,G})$ is $|E(G_1 \cap G_2)| + |V(G_1 \cap G_2)| - 1$.*

Proof. The dimension of a flow polytope of G is $|E(G)| - |V(G)| + 1$ [1]. Since $|E(\widetilde{G_1 \cap G_2})| = |E(G_1 \cap G_2)| + 2|V(G_1 \cap G_2)|$, $|V(\widetilde{G_1 \cap G_2})| = |V(G_1 \cap G_2)| + 2$, the result follows.

□

Theorem 23. *Let G_1, G_2 and G_3 be three leaves of $R_G^{\mathcal{O}}$ so that $G_1 \cap G_2 \subset G_1 \cap G_3$. Then*

$$\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{G_1\cap G_2}}(\mathbf{c}_{G_1\cap G_2,G}) \subset \mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{G_1\cap G_3}}(\mathbf{c}_{G_1\cap G_3,G}). \tag{38}$$

Proof. Recall that by Theorem 19, $\mathbf{c}_{G_1\cap G_2,G}$ can be obtained from $\mathbf{c}^{G_1,G}$ by setting $c^{G_1,G}(e) = 0$ for all $e \notin G_1 \cap G_2$ and $\mathbf{c}_{G_1\cap G_3,G}$ can be obtained from $\mathbf{c}^{G_1,G}$ by setting $c^{G_1,G}(e) = 0$ for all $e \notin G_1 \cap G_3$. Thus, $\mathbf{c}_{G_1\cap G_2,G}$ can be obtained from $\mathbf{c}_{G_1\cap G_3,G}$ by setting $\mathbf{c}_{G_1\cap G_3,G}(e) = 0$ for all $e \in (G_1 \cap G_3) - (G_1 \cap G_2)$. Thus given $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{G_1\cap G_2}}(\mathbf{c}_{G_1\cap G_2,G})$ it follows that $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{G_1\cap G_3}}(\mathbf{c}_{G_1\cap G_3,G})$ proving (38). □

References

[1] W. Baldoni and M. Vergne. Kostant partitions functions and flow polytopes. *Transform. Groups*, 13(3-4):447–469, 2008.

[2] V. I. Danilov, Karzanov A.V., and G. A. Koshevoy. Coherent fans in the space of flows in framed graphs. *DMTSC proc., FPSAC 2012 Nagoya, Japan*, pages 483–494, 2012.

[3] S. Fomin and A. N. Kirillov. Quadratic algebras, dunkl elements, and schubert calculus. *Advances in Geometry*, (172).

[4] A. N. Kirillov. Ubiquity of Kostka polynomials. *arXiv*, math.QA, Dec 1999.

[5] A.N. Kirillov. On some combinatorial and algebraic properties of Dunkl elements. *RIMS preprint*, 2012.

[6] A.N. Kirillov. On some quadratic algebras, Dunkl elements, schubert, grothendieck, tutte and reduced polynomials. *RIMS preprint*, 2014.

[7] K. Mészáros. Product formulas for volumes of flow polytopes. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., to appear.*

[8] K. Mészáros. Root polytopes, triangulations, and the subdivision algebra, I. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 363(8):4359–4382, 2011.

[9] K. Mészáros. Root polytopes, triangulations, and the subdivision algebra, II. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 363(11):6111–6141, 2011.

[10] K. Mészáros. h-polynomials via reduced forms. 2014. arXiv:1407.2685.

[11] K. Mészáros and A. H. Morales. Flow polytopes of signed graphs and the Kostant partition function. *International Mathematical Research Notices, to appear.*

[12] A. Postnikov, 2010. personal communication.

[13] R.P. Stanley. Acyclic flow polytopes and Kostant's partition function. Conference transparencies, `http://math.mit.edu/~rstan/trans.html`, 2000.

E-mail address: `karola@math.cornell.edu`

Department of Mathematics, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853